

The Implications of Gated Society in Jakarta Metropolitan Region: A Multiple-Case Study in Tangerang District, Banten, Indonesia

INDAH SURYA WARDHANI

Affiliated to Research Centre for Politic and Government, at Department Politics and Government (PolGov), Universitas Gadjah Mada, Email: indahsuryaw@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper argued that the gating system intensifies existing divergence of the gated communities and the kampung communities. The significant dissimilarities between the residents and the dwellers strongly indicate social inequality. The notion of gated society at the neighborhood level remains problematic. The existence of fortress raises some ethical questions whether the rich, the high-level professional, and the famous have right to fort to themselves and keep other citizens out, whether they have privilege to set the boundaries and live separately from society as well as maintain the amenities exclusively. The gated society inevitably brings enormous policy consequences. This paper recommend housing policy as social legislation to regulate the notion of gated society. The long term practices of exclusion within fortress, and public space privatization will impede the function and very idea of the future citizenship. Beyond social redistribution, the principle idea of housing policy is promoting inclusive right for sustainable development. The absence of the inclusiveness results in a decline of democracy.

Keyword: gated community, social segregation, inequality, housing policy, citizenship

INTRODUCTION

The setting of boundaries is always a political act since boundaries determine space and membership thereby to facilitate the purposes of political, economic, and social life (Blakely, E.J. and Snyder,

M.G., 1997). Gated community is the dramatic forms of the new residential space that was previously integrated with the larger shared civic space.

It is believed that dispersion of gated communities throughout Jakarta Metropolitan Region (JMR) has been associated with emerging of new towns development in the last two decades. They are built in the urban periphery and constructed largely as exclusive residential with excellent infrastructures and urban lifestyle amenities, as well as 24-hours security system.


Despite of economic crisis in 1998, new towns development has been promising property businesses spreading toward the outskirts. The number of new town in JMR is growing vividly in the las decade. There had been 23 new towns projects by nearly 260 developers ranging from 500 to 6,000 ha in size at the end of 2001 (Firman, 2004). A decade later, Real Estate Indonesia (REI), an association of Indonesia's corporate housing developers, claimed that there are 25 new towns covering very more or less 21,000 ha size in total (Ganie, 2010).

The earliest new town project apparently responded the Instruction of President no 13/1976 of Development of Jakarta Metropolitan Area.¹ The policy prescribed enforcement of secondary growth centers in outskirts of Jakarta by generating investments for trade and industry activities as well as residential in suburbs. The policy positively enhanced industrial estates to develop new town as self-contained neighborhoods (*kota mandiri*) complete with urban and employment centers to decline congestion in city center of Jakarta in 1980s. The several highway projects of JMR were launched in the early 1980s and Law no 4/1992 of Housing and Settlements fertilized the spreading of new town enriched conurbation area.²

As can be seen, the first policy fostered opening access of suburbs increased the absorption of investment while the second boosted broad expansion of private industrial estates. Those poli-

cies result consequences, including reducing carrying capacity of the metropolitan core and increasing carrying capacity of the fringes on the one hand, as well as highlighting privatization of planning on the other hand (Hudalah, D. and Firman, T., 2012). The following figure shows magnitude of new town and its gated communities in generating new spatial pattern of residencies in JMR.

FIGURE 1: SPREAD OF NEW TOWN IN JMR



Source: (Herlambang, 2011)

The notion of new towns and gated communities spread throughout the outskirts of JMR positive as well as negative externalities. It may have desirable effects at the sub-national and district level of administration, by increasing average income in suburbs and decreasing economic gap with DKI Jakarta. Moreover, the dispersion

of gated communities often comes along with the development of amenities and utilities, such as streets and commercial business districts. However, the implications of gated community at the neighbourhood level tend to bring disadvantages since it disperses vastly in the villages, which are the original kampungs of native ethnic.

Based on the research, this paper explains the implications of gated communities in Jakarta Metropolitan Region. The research on a multiple-case of gated communities with varying continuum of disclosure at Tangerang District, Province of Banten provided evidences on how gated communities intensify differentiation and inequality in the society, decline social integration, and discourage the authority of local government. Hence, this paper attempts to argue the undesirable impacts of gated community at the neighborhood level, notably social segregation and withdrawal citizenship.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Gated community has been defined in varies ways. Basically, it is identified by the setting of boundary and territory. They define gated community as residential areas with restricted access in which security developments with designated perimeters, usually walls or fences and controlled entrances (Blakely, E.J. and Snyder, M.G., 1997). Similar definition, a gated society is defined as a residential development surrounded by walls, fences, or earth banks covered with bushes and shrubs, with a secured entrance (Low S., 2003, p. 11). Unlike the condominium building or apartment, gated community are different in terms of their fences, boundaries, and territories, precluding public access to streets, playground, sidewalks, parks, beaches, rivers, and all utilities, which without fences will be open and shared by all citizen of a locality.

Regarding the fortress and enclosure, gated communities are often associated with a 'culture of fear' and risk experienced within the

city center. The discourse of urban fear encodes other social concerns including class, race, and ethnic exclusivity as well as gender (Low S. M., 2001). Security zone and gating system defend of crime and outsider (Blakely, E.J. and Snyder, M.G., 1997).

Considering the continuum of enclosure, there are eight classification of gates based on two common appearances, i.e. how the marking of boundary and how the existing control of the main entrance (Grant, J. and Mittelsteadt, 2004). Wall creates “demarcation” which restricts access of undesirable people or subgroups as part of response to the fear of crime, violence to people, and poverty (Thorns, 2002). Not only reflecting the fear, the fortified enclave is treated as a spatial expression of increasing urban conflict (Manzi, T. and Bowers, B.S., 2006).

Hence, to live within the fortress and wall might create the sense of community. The communities perceive collective identity of themselves by encouraging sense of collective life naturally like in local area and also selective act of imagination like the same impulse life (Sennett, 1976). Gated community is categorized into three typologies based on the functions, i.e. lifestyle community, prestige community, and security zone community (Blakely, E.J. and Snyder, M.G., 1997). The important social values in residents’ consideration are sense of community, exclusion, privatization, and stability. It reflects not just feeling but also participation in the social life of a place that implies sharing of territory, particularly social interaction, including identity, values, desires, and common goals as well as maintaining social ladder.

Furthermore gated community has been classified as residential with legal agreements consideration, which tie the residents to a common code of conduct and collective responsibility. A legal framework means allow the extraction of monies to maintain of common utilities and services combine with a physical structure, which include gated and walls enclosing space (Atkinson, R. and Blandy, S.,

2006). This definition also considers as economic terms as a conceptualization of holding property right developed through collective action of individual for individual. In similar definition, gated community is clarified as club goods due to the excludability of use by its pricing and membership requirements (Manzi, T. and Smith-Bowers, B., 2006). The privatized enclosures of public space aimed community homeowner control. They intensify exclusionary land use practices in place shows how struggles emerge between communities and districts over tax payments for public services that have been privatized behind the gates and walls of such communities (Low S., 2003).

To sum up, the setting of boundaries is always a political act since boundaries determine space and membership. It is underlined the gated community brought policy consequences since it is clarified as club goods which has legal framework which allows some citizens have economic and social privilege, sets walled territory, excludes others citizens as well as withdrawals from public contact.

The implications of gated communities on segregation are persistently discussed since the experiences and externalities had different effects on different levels of administration. Gated community has positive externalities such as improving a physical environment, job opportunity, a modern image toward surrounding area (Alvarez-Rivadulla, 2007), reduce the scale of residential segregation between city centre and suburbs by increasing land price, spreading middle-upper income groups throughout the city, decreasing economic gap, and promoting some forms of urban facilities (Salcedo, R. and Torres, A., 2004) (Sabatini, F. and Salcedo, R., 2007).

It is believed that gated community brings high investing on urban infrastructure, highways, fibre optic and telecommunication networks (Hudalah and Firman 2012, Sabatini and Salcedo 2007). The development stimulates the dynamic of the contemporary sub-

urban in outskirts of metropolis Jakarta as a global trend of post-suburbia (Hudalah and Firman 2012). Despite urban sprawl, new town has been claimed creates new opportunities, which involves concentration of hi-tech industries and multinational companies, converting formerly neglected rural hinterland into suburban industrial estates. New town reflects cultural integration since the residents mostly are migrants from other regions in Indonesia, even expatriates, who have cultural diversity of ethnic and religion (Leisch, 2002).

On the contrary, these undesirable impacts became evidences in neighbourhood level. Gated community implies negative consequences as a kind of a new housing market, which is a symbol of metropolitan fragmentation (Le Goix, 2005). A walled quarter associates with urban inequality (Vaselinov et al. 2007) and separation with social context and different social groups (Le Goix 2005, Atkinson and Flint 2004). The dispersion of gated communities indicates how the private interests take over public space by zoning, taxes and incorporation of gated communities (Low, Setha, 2006).

The expansion of new towns development in JMR also parallels with gentrification by rising land prices in the periphery and in some cases displaces established communities. The massive developments of new towns in outskirts of Jakarta denote land speculative by private developers, facilitated by government, which has been a vast land ownership transfer from the previous landowners, mostly disadvantage farmers to the new town developers. They tend to invade suburban areas where are home or original village of Betawi or Sundanese ethnics - indigenous ethnic inhabiting in Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, and Bekasi (Firman 2004).

In brief, the existing knowledge could not answer precisely the implication of gated community on social-spatial segregation since gated communities brought different evidence at different levels of governance. Gated communities as the private communities is a

response to national and sub-national governments' (municipal and district level) failure to provide adequate neighbourhood services and supply services in rapidly growing areas. However, the dispersion of gated communities in neighbourhood level tend to brought undesirable impact since it invades *kampungs* and often displaces the native communities.

The idea of public sphere as an arena of political deliberation and participation is fundamental to democratic governance. In Habermas' account, the ideal of public sphere is supposed universal and thereby in any meaningful sense, spatially undifferentiated. It implies that the spatial changing has impact to the public deliberation in the public space (Low, S. and Smith, N. (ed), 2006). In other words, there are the relationship between public space and the public sphere (Harvey, 2006).

Equally important, the notion of citizenship is very complex that characteristic and dimensions remain open for competing conception. A critical geography introduced the political continuum of space - from territory, scale, to sphere - has formed the interconnected dimensions of the citizenship, notably membership, legal status, rights, and participation (Stokke, 2014).

With this intention, the implication of gated communities has emerged by a critical geography of space that brought into studies of citizenship, social policy decision making, and setting up the "right to the city". The contemporary political economy has underlined the importance of understanding the space, which identity politics, citizenship, and political agendas are articulated and struggled over (McCann, 2002, pp. 77-79). It is believed that the patterns of gated communities have demonstrated some of the ways that public sphere is affected by physical urban forms of residential organization (Donoso, 2009).

Furthermore, the property right permits association of residents enhances self-governance in maintaining common utilities by pric-

ing and exclusive membership requirements (Atkinson, R. and Blandy, S., 2006) (Blakely, E.J. and Snyder, M.G., 1997). Here the issue is less one of replacing failing city services that controlling residential space (Blakely, E.J. and Snyder, M.G., 1997). It is not surprising that those who can afford to turn public services to private service provision do, such as privatizing their streets and buying security, and other services on the private markets.

In other words, space privatization by fortress and enclosure provides the sense of community for those who are 'members' rather than 'citizens'. The setting of boundaries is always a political act since boundaries determine space and membership (Blakely, E.J. and Snyder, M.G., 1997). Gated community is clarified as club goods due to the excludability of use by its pricing and membership requirements (Manzi, T. and Smith-Bowers, B., 2006).

In the long run, gated communities brought consequences on public sphere due to their wall and legal status. The privileges in political economy constructs exclusion brought inequality issue that hampered the citizenship.

RESEARCH METHOD

The scope of the study is to examine the implications of gated society at the neighborhood level, and to what extent gating impacts on citizenship. This study is based on gated communities locate at three private estates territories in Tangerang District. The three territories are close each to other, established on the total area up to 5,000 hectares. Those are in the outskirts area, where are around 25 kilometers from Jakarta City center.

The selected cases have different features on marking the boundaries and continuum controls of the main entrance. The three cases are Block Thin Islamic Village with enable-gating case, Sector 7 A/B Gading Serpong with semi restricts gating, Lestari Cluster Lippo Karawaci with full restrict-gating case. The following table presents

the continuum of enclosures and varying features differences on the cases.

TABLE1. THE FEATURES OF GATED COMMUNITIES3

Features	Islamic Village	Gading Serpong	Lippo Karawaci
Security features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Open quarter without wall ▪ Guard station – swing arm gate ▪ Low fence hedge between houses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Walled quarter ▪ Guard station – swing arm gate ▪ Low fence hedge between houses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Walled quarter ▪ Guard station – swing arm gate ▪ No fence hedge between houses
Amenities and facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Private roads ▪ Easy access to the major road (province/regency street) ▪ Quality design ▪ Institutional facilities ▪ Worship facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Private roads ▪ Easy access to the major road (province/regency street) ▪ Quality design ▪ Institutional facilities ▪ Worship facilities ▪ Recreational facilities ▪ Commercial facilities ▪ Police station close to the site¹ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Private roads ▪ Easy access to the major road (province/regency street) ▪ Quality design ▪ Institutional facilities ▪ Worship facilities ▪ Recreational facilities ▪ Commercial facilities ▪ Transportation system ▪ Home care and landscape maintenance ▪ Police and military station within the site²
Type of residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Homogeneous by class and religion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Homogenous by class 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Homogenous by class
Policy context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Enable gating ▪ RT/RW as a neighborhood governance system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Semi restrict gating ▪ RT/RW as a neighborhood governance system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Restrict gating ▪ TMD as a municipal management system

¹ It is not stated on the official website, but empirically the station is existing close to the site

² It is not stated on the official website, but empirically the station is existing within the site

Source: (Wardhani, 2012)

This research is an exploratory one, as it attempts to elaborate the implications of gated community as a contemporary phenomenon toward a context of social segregation in JMR. Since the boundaries between the phenomenon and the context are not evidence, this research applied a multiple-case design to strive optimum exploration on phenomenon of gated communities (Yin, 1991). Hence, the slightly different outcomes are expected, which every case serves a specific purpose within the overall context of inquiry.

To describe the phenomenon, the study aims for objective analysis. Hence, the study applies a set of instruments to construct a triangulation of data (Yin, 1991). The applied instruments for data collection methods are below:

- Participant observation using semi-structured observation guide: It intends to capture dynamic of the communities, how each community perceiving identity, sharing tract, and activities of intragroup and intergroup relation in the daily life.
- Survey using structured questionnaires. Questionnaire is considered as an efficient way for assembling responses from a large sample prior to quantitative overview analyses (Saunders et al. 2003). Targeted households are selected by simple random based on their site plots of the house. The targeted respondent to answer the questionnaire is member of the household, who has minimum age 17 years old or already married.
- In-depth interview with semi-structured questions. It is mainly looking for qualitative data in capturing rich understanding of perception and more insight of causal processes. Targeted respondents of in-depth interview are selected purposively determined by snowball methods.
- Secondary resources are from documents, such as regulation, publications, etc.

The study applies a multiple-case design with three selected cases of gated communities within the three private estate territories in Tangerang District. This study took sample purposively on one clustered residence, which is close to the native sub village (*kampung*). Each case compounds of a gated community and a kampung community in its vicinities. Each case can provide a valuable insight despite the limitation is more difficult to justify extending the results and conclusion to larger population (Black 1993b). The selected cases are: (1) Block Thin and Kampung Kalipaten in the Islamic village; (2) Sector 7 A/B and Kampung Cicayur Kaler in Gading Serpong Township; (3) Lestari Cluster and Kampung Peusar in Lippo Karawaci Township.

To select the respondents, the study applies two sampling meth-

ods. *First* is the simple random sampling on the location of houses to get total 167 respondents (not including 23 respondents, who rejected). *Second* is the snowballing sampling to seek 30 respondents in three cases, as well as 5 respondents from the authority's side for answering semi-structured questions of in depth interviews.

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

This part presents findings and the analysis. It confirmed that quantitative data from the survey brought the general pattern of the gated communities in terms of state of opinion and attitude of people as quantitative data while qualitative data from in-depth interview captured the rich understanding beyond the general pattern.

The statistic tests the influence of explanatory variable (X) and dummy variable (D) to dependent variable (Y) the opinion toward enclosure. It confirmed that opinion toward enclosure tend to be neutral (mean 3.4/5.00), in terms of gating: walled territory, CCTV monitoring, 24-hours security, and checking gates for visitors.

Statistic tested how strong the influence of explanatory variable (X) and dummy variable (D) of the affected variable (Y). With the stepwise, only six of 14 variables which can be analyzed further as it have a strong correlation with the affected variable (Y). Here are the results of multiple regressions to the processing of correlation X and Y.

T (0,788) (0,001) (0,000) (0,001) (0,043) (0,014) (0,024)
 se (0.215) (0.162) (0.062) (0.60) (0.124) (0.072) (0.179)
 R² (0.454)

- * The variations of explanatory variables (X) and dummy variables (D) or model explained 45.4 % toward enclosure (Y). The rest may be explained by the others.

- * Durbin Watson = 1,626 ($1 < DW < 3$) indicated there is no autocorrelation.
- * F test = 0,00 explained the significant of variable for analysis
- * T test < 0.10 explained the significant of variable at 90 % confidence level
- * VIF below 1 indicated no multicorrelation.

Regression equation:

$$Y = -0.058 + 0.241X1 - 0.202X2 + 0.177X3 + 0.555D1 + 0.253D2 - 0.407D3$$

Y = State of opinion toward enclosure

“ = constant

X1 = perception toward developer

X2 = trust to the neighbour in same neighbourhood (*intragroup*)

X3 = perception toward amenities

D1 = home location

D2 = gender

D3 = religion

The equation indicated that the gating is acceptable due to some consideration. The behavior and attitude influencing the acceptance of the enclosure are following:

- The opinion toward enclosure (Y) is influenced by perception toward developer (X1), degree of trust in intragroup relation (X2), perception toward amenities (X3), and various dummy variables (demographics), notably the home location, gender, and religion.
- The higher level of perception toward developer (X1), the more level of acceptance toward enclosure with other variables held constant
- The lower level of trust among intragroup relation (X2), the more level of acceptance toward enclosure, with other variables held

constant.

- The higher level of perception toward amenities (X3), the more level of acceptance toward enclosure, with other variables held constant.
- There is difference in the level of acceptance toward enclosure among respondents living in the cluster and in the kampung amounted 0.555, with other variables held constant.
- There is difference in the level of acceptance toward enclosure among men and women respondents amounted 0.235, with other variables held constant.
- There is difference in the level of acceptance toward enclosure among respondents who are Muslim and not Muslim amounted 0.407, with other variables held constant

As comparative study, the research revealed similarities and dissimilarities in terms of highlighting indicators. The gated communities and the kampung communities obviously have spatial differences in terms of gating. The spatial differences lead how they perceive themselves as the community.

The data presentation responds to three questions, which aimed to answer the main research question, what are the effects of gated communities on social segregation in Jakarta Metropolitan Region.

Q1: What are the perceptions of established community toward gated community and vice versa?

This study revealed that perception toward other group is often formed based on dissimilarities rather than similarities. The survey showed that the gated communities and the kampung communities have significant dissimilarities, in terms of physical, economic, and social aspects.

The gated communities are heterogeneous by ethnicity and religion, but homogenous by class and status while the kampung com-

munities are homogenous by ethnicity (Sundanese) and religion (Islam). Only Block Thin is gated community, which is also homogenous by religion. Furthermore, two groups have perception to identify themselves on the highlighting dissimilarities in terms of physical aspects (housing and spatial separation), economical aspects (main occupation, level of expenditure) and social (education level, religion, and ethnicity).

Both of the groups often notice these dissimilarities as stereotype to perceive the other group. The gated communities tend to consider the social ladder and behaviour to label the *kampung* communities. They have the perception that *kampung* communities consist of uneducated people, who typically have unmannered attitudes. The lack of economic capacities is merely caused by low achievement due to avoiding competition, consumerism, and unorganized family finance. These perceptions are different with the *kampung* communities, who are more sensitive to economic class and social identity differences. They perceive the gated communities as the elite circles, who have power and money. In terms of identity, the *kampung* communities often perceive the gated communities according to the ethnic or religion majority. Chinese ethnic identity is remaining perceived as the “others” group, which is different from other Indonesian ethnicities.

Furthermore, the various gated communities have different type of gates and security measures. These create varying sense of feeling secure within the gates, which influence how the gated communities perceive the *kampung* territory as their vicinities and vice versa. In general, the gated communities perceive the walls as a physical measure to protect the family and property. They feel more secure within the gates but feel less secure when they consider surrounding *kampungs*. The full restricted gates create a strong sense of feeling secure within the gated community compared to the others type of gating. At the same time, the full-restricted gates reflect more

anxiety to its kampung vicinities compared to the other type of gating.

On the contrary, the kampung communities perceive the gates differently. Security became issue in kampungs since the walled residencies spread over. High security measurement does not increase the security of kampung and the residence even often attracts the threats to its surrounding. Considering symbolic value, the kampung communities perceive the gates restrict their access to their economic resources and the gates as a boundary of other space, where people have different norms and customs. The gating facilitates the existing differentiation in the two groups.

Q2: What are the interactions between established community and gated community; and what are the interactions among gated community?

The varying features of gates influence how the gated communities maintain the intra and intergroup interaction. The social life of both the gated communities and the kampung communities are concentrated within their own-neighborhood (intragroup) but the gated communities have less intimate relationship with their neighbors compared to the kampung communities. This implies that the gated communities and the kampung communities have dissimilarities in their intragroup interaction.

Since the social lives are concentrated within the own group, the gated communities and the kampung communities have less interaction with each other (intergroup). The interactions between the two groups tend to be functional rather than intimate. They are often related to economic exchange or institutional social events. Some social values influence the dynamic of the interaction at the individual level, such as religious or humanism value. The relationships between the two groups reflect and reproduce the social and economic inequalities.

Furthermore, the dissimilarity of the social system between the gated community and the kampung communities is witnessed also

in the varying governance types. The gated communities, which adopted RT/RW system similar with the kampung communities, they have worse participation compared to the kampung communities. The gated community, which applies private governance system unlike the kampung communities, has better participation compared to the kampung community. However, the private governance system consequently reduces intensity of the intergroup interaction between the gated community and the kampung community. The private governance system also tends to decrease the role of informal leaders, who facilitate the interactions between the two groups like often appear in the RT/RW system.

Q3: What are the obstacles and the forces for interactions, and how is the social segregation mitigated?

The dissimilarities between the gated communities and the kampung communities strongly indicate the social segregation. In addition, the low interactions between the two groups also strongly indicate the social segregation. The gated communities and the kampung communities have different perception about the issue.

The variation in gating influences how the gated communities perceive empirically the existing segregation. The open gating community tends not to perceive the segregation issue empirically since there is no physical barrier between the gated community and the kampung community. The less restricts gating community tends to be more sensitive to the segregation issue compared to the full restricts gating community. This is because the less restricted gating community tends to associate segregation with the security concern, which raises threats of thieves. Whereas the full restricted gating community tend not associate the segregation issue with the security concern since feels more secure within the fortress.

There are two forces, which mitigate the social segregation by encouraging interaction between the gated communities and the kampung communities. *First*, the dispersions of the gated commu-

nities in the suburbs area inevitably bring spill over effects to the kampungs. These often make the economic gap and social segregation tolerable for the kampung communities. *Second*, some actors, who are mostly from the gated communities' side, play essential roles to facilitate and embrace the intergroup interaction. The actors also have crucial position to ease the awkward situation between the gated communities and the kampung communities. These actors are able to create sharing activities, which can transform vicinities consideration into the proximities as a based of trust, like showed security coordination between the gated communities and the kampung communities during Jakarta riots 1998.

However, there are four obstacles, which encourage the social segregation. *First*, the physical dissimilarities strongly discourage contacts between the gated communities and the kampung communities. The physical dissimilarities are not only the physical barriers (e.g. walls, arm swing gates) but also the spatial separation, which the gated communities live within the exclusive enclave whereas the kampung communities live within the native kampungs.

Second, the economic gap and social differences create an awkward situation, which hampers interaction between the gated communities and the kampung communities. Both groups face uncomfortable situation to initiate interactions between them.

Third, the gated communities are criticised for creating insufficient opportunity for vertical social mobilization. The professional jobs require certain level of education and specific skill, which often form obstacles for the kampung communities and further reproduce the inequalities between two groups.

Fourth, the private governance system in the gated community strengthens the dissimilarities between two groups since the local government legitimizes the private governance system is equal with the RT/RW system. This situation also discourages the institutional contacts between the government apparatus and the citizen.

DISCUSSION

In general, this study of gated communities is compatible with the existing literature. However, this study also noticed different evidences from the existing literatures. Those differences occur within the interactions between the gated communities and the kampung communities at the neighbourhood level and individual level. Those differences are presented as follow:

First, these studies found that in general, the gated communities aware of the security concern. The gated communities are the security zone community, which the gates defend for fear of crime and outsiders (Blakely and Snyder 1997). This implies that the gated communities feel secure within their gates but unsecure with the kampung in vicinities outside the gates. Conversely, one case of this study revealed kampung community feels unsecure living close to the gated community since the threats of thief toward the gated community disperse to the native kampung.

Second, the gated communities are classified as club goods, which the holding of property rights has capacity to apply exclusion of use as stated by Manzi and Smith-Bowers (2006). It brings consequence that private policy of the gated communities allows some citizen to separate from public contact and exclude others from their economic and social privilege. This study found that the local social economic context influences how the gated communities apply their private policy to their vicinities. The research also found that gated communities have double standards in applying the enclosure. On the one hand, the gated communities put restriction in the walled quarters to protect the housing of residents. On the other hand, gated communities open other private territories for public. Regarding the vicinities, the gated communities share amenities and create spatial interaction with the kampung communities, particularly to share the road utilities however it aimed to reduce the tension of potential conflict.

Third, prior studies perceived gated communities as the upper middle class communities, who built fortress for seeking exclusivity, prestige, security (Blakely and Snyder 1997). Gates and walls encode class relation and segregate permanently in the built spatial identities and spatial power (Low 2001). This study revealed that the gated communities do not exactly withdrawal from the native community since they facilitate economic interaction between the gated communities and the kampung communities. The economic exchanges between the gated communities and the kampung communities are essential mechanism to reduce segregation despite further reproduce some patterns of social inequalities and economic stratification.

The economic exchanges occur at two levels of interactions. At the neighbourhood level, economic exchanges can be designed as job opportunities within the private territories such as security guards, or opportunities to run informal business such as motor taxi (ojek). At the individual interactions, the economic exchanges are often shaped as the master and labour relationships. The study revealed that the economic exchange at the individual level is more complex than it appears in the neighbourhood level. It is often coincide with the social exchange, which contains religious values and local customs. This makes the kampung communities are often dependent to the gated communities.

Four, some evidences from Latin America showed that the dispersions of gated communities towards the city do not always cause segregation. They even reduce the scale of residential segregation (Sabatini and Salcedo 2007). However, at the lower level, this study revealed that the gated communities effects social segregation in the neighborhood level. The gating facilitates existing differentiation between the gated communities and the kampung communities and thus hampers the interactions between them.

CONCLUSION

Presenting the conclusions of this study, this final part consists of two sections. *First* section presents the results to answer the main research questions: what are the implications of gated communities. Second section attempts to link the study's conclusions to the existing literature.

This study revealed that gated communities create undesirable impacts at the neighbourhood level. It confirmed that the gating facilitates cognitive differentiation, which exists between the gated communities and the kampung communities. The experiences of the three cases show that development of the gated communities in the suburbs area mainly motivated by the desire for amenities and security measures. The gated communities are voluntarily segregated themselves within the exclusive quarter to live separately from the kampung communities.

There are significant dissimilarities between the gated communities and the kampung communities, which strongly indicate social segregation between the two communities. Furthermore, the low interactions between the two groups also indicate segregation. The variation in gating influences how the gated communities perceive the segregation issue. The open gating community tends not to perceive the segregation issue since there is no physical barrier between the two groups. The less restricts gating community tends to be more sensitive to the segregation issue compared to the full restricts gating community.

The variation in gating further influences the perceptions and the interactions between the gated communities and the kampung communities. The gating raised four highlighting issues, including:

First, the gating facilitates the physical, economical, and social dissimilarities between the gated communities and the kampung communities. In this case, the gated communities are heterogeneous by ethnicity, but homogenous by class and status whereas the

kampung communities are established communities, which homogeneous by ethnicity (Sundanese) and religion (Islam). The physical barriers and the spatial separation reflect the cognitive differentiation in two groups and further influence perception toward each other. These situations accumulate into an uncooperative situation between the gated communities and the kampung communities.

Second, the gating discourages integration between the gated communities as the migrant communities and the kampung communities as the receiving communities. The three cases revealed that interactions between the two groups tend to be functional, which often related to economic exchange between the employers and the employees. On the one hand, economic interactions decrease social segregation and make the dissimilarities tolerable for the kampung communities. On the other hand, the economic interactions do not exactly diminish the social segregation by reproduce some patterns of social inequalities.

Third, regarding the security concerns, the open gating spreads sense of insecurity to the vicinities. One experience of the case revealed that the threats of thief toward the gated community disperse to the native kampung thus make the kampung community feel unsecure living close to the gated community which on the contrary operates high-measurement of security.

Fourth, the full restricted gating discourages interaction between the gated communities and the kampung communities by applied private governance system. One experience of the case revealed that the private governance system of the gated community strengthen the legal administrative separation with the kampung territory, which applies RT/RW system. Since the local government admits the private governance system equals with the RT/RW system, the gated community perceives legitimation to privatize the space and exclude outsiders to access amenities. This situation also discourages the institutional contacts between the government apparatus and citi-

zens.

All things considered, this paper argued that gating created spatial segregation that raised social segregation and discouraged the authority of local government. The long term practices of gating will impede the function and very idea of citizenship. This paper intensely recommend social legislation to regulate the notion of gated society. Housing policy is essential to control the implications of exclusion within the walled quarters and privatization of space in the long term

ENDNOTES

- ¹ Rosalina, P. 2011, "Penjalaran Kota yang Membawa Masalah Baru", Kompas, Monday, 8 Agustus, p. 27.
- ² Triana, N. 2011, "Tantangan Besar Menata Jabodetabek", Kompas, Tuesday, 26 July, p. 27.
- ³ The observation table is developed based on the Types of gated communities (Grant and Mittelsteadt 2004)
- ⁴ It is not stated on the official website, but empirically the station is existing close to the site
- ⁵ It is not stated on the official website, but empirically the station is existing within the site

REFERENCE

- Manzi, T. and Smith-Bowers, B. (2006). Gated Communities as Club Goods: Segregation Or Social Cohesion? In S. (. Atkinson R. and Blandy, *Gated Community* (pp. 153-166). Ney York: Routledge.
- Alvarez-Rivadulla, M. (2007). Golden Ghettos: Gated Communities and Class Residential Segregation in Montevideo, Uruguay. *Environment and Planning, 39 (A)*, 47-63.
- Atkinson, R. and Blandy, S. (2006). Introduction: International Perspectives on the New Enclavism and the Rise of Gated Communities. In R. a. Atkinson, *Gated Communities* (pp. vii-xv). New York: Routledge.
- Blakely, E.J. and Snyder, M.G. (1997). Divided We Fall: Gated and Walled Communities in the United States. In N. Ellin, *Architecture of Fear*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.
- Blakely, E.J. and Snyder, M.G. (1997). *Fortress America, Gated Communities in the United States*. Washington D.C: Brooking Institution Press.

- Donoso, R. E. (2009). Gated Communities, Public Sphere and Citizenship in the Latin American City. *XXVIII International Congress of the Latin American Studies Association*. Rio de Janeiro.
- Firman, T. (2004). New Town Development in Jakarta Metropolitan Region: A Perspective of Spatial Segregation. *Habitat International* 28, 3, 349-368.
- Ganie, H. (2010). Trend Perkembangan Kota Baru. *Internal discussion*, 26 July 2011. Jakarta: Kompas Daily.
- Grant, J. and Mittelsteadt. (2004). Types of Gated Communities. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 913-930.
- Harvey, D. (2006). The Political Economy of Public Space. In S. a. Low, *The Politics of Public Space* (pp. 17-34). New York: Routledge.
- Herlambang, S. (2011). *Profil Pengembangan Kota Baru Di Jabodetabek 1985-2010*.
- Hudalah, D. and Firman, T. (2012). Beyond Property: Industrial Estates and Post-Suburban Transformation in Jakarta Metropolitan Region Cities. *Cities*, 29 no. 1, 40-48.
- Le Goix, R. (2005). Gated Communities: Sprawl and Social Segregation in Southern California. *Housing Studies*, 323-343.
- Leisch, H. (2002). Gated Communities in Indonesia. *Cities*, 19(5), 341-350.
- Low, S. (2003). *Behind the Gates, Life Security, and The Pursuit of Happiness in Fortress America*. New York: Routledge.
- Low, S. and Smith, N. (ed). (2006). Introduction: The Imperative of Public Space. In S. a. Low, *The Politics of Public Space* (pp. 1-16). New York: Routledge.
- Low, S. M. (2001, March). The Edge and the Center: Gated Communities and the Discourse of Urban Fear. *American Anthropologist, New Series*, 103(1), 45-58.
- Low, Seta. (2006). How Private Interests Take Over Public Space: Zoning, Taxes, and Incorporation of Gated Communities. In S. a. Low, *The Politics of Public Space* (pp. 81-103). New York: Routledge.
- Manzi, T. and Bowers, B.S. (2006, November). Private security and Public Space: New Approaches to the Theory and practice of Gated Communities. *European Journal of Spatial Development*, No.22, 1-17.
- McCann, E. J. (2002). Space, Citizenship, and the Right to the City: A brief overview. *GeoJournal*, 77-79.
- Sennett, R. (1976). Community Become Uncivilized. In R. (. Sennett, *The Fall of Public Man* (pp. 294-312). Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press.
- Stokke, K. (2014, March 9). Retrieved 11 16, 2015, from [www.researchgate.net: http://www.researchgate.net/publication/260599279_Conceptualizing_the_Politics_of_Citizenship](http://www.researchgate.net/publication/260599279_Conceptualizing_the_Politics_of_Citizenship)
- Thorns, D. C. (2002). Urban Social Inequality and Social Exclusion. In D. C. Thorns, *The Transformation of Cities, Urban Theories and Urban Life* (pp. 149-177). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Wardhani, I. (2012). *Thesis: Implications of Gated Communities to Social Segregation in Jakarta Metropolitan Region (JMR): A multiple case study in Tangerang Regency, Banten Province, Indonesia*. Rotterdam: IHS of Erasmus University.
- Yin, R. (1991). Designing Single and Multiple-Case Studies. In R. Yin, *Designing Single Case Study Research Design and Methods* (pp. 19-54). Newbury park: Sage.